

REMARKS

This application has been amended so as to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

The Official Action rejects claims 1-3, 10-12, 16-19 and 24 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by IKEDA et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

At the outset, applicants notes that the device of IKEDA et al. includes a conventional, single axis hinge, not a 2-axis hinge as required by claim 1 as originally filed, and as now amended. Considering, for example, Figures 1A-1C, 2A, and 2B, one of the two axes allows for flip rotation or fold rotation of the upper and lower housings with respect to one another. This is illustrated in Figures 1A-1C. The second axis of rotation allows the upper and lower housings to slide with respect to one another, as illustrated in Figures 2A and 2B. The IKEDA et al. device appears to allow for rotation only like that illustrated in Figures 1A-1C of the present application, but not like that of Figures 2A and 2B, or any other second axis of rotation.

If the IKEDA et al. reference is again applied against one or more claims in the present application in the next Official Action for its purported disclosure of a 2-axis hinge, applicant respectfully requests that such interpretation be

explained in detail, including identification of the two axes required by the present claims.

Original claim 1 recites, among other features, an information input device mounted in an exposed portion of the 2-axis hinge. The Official Action reads this recitation on the camera 400 of the IKEDA et al. device.

In order to sharpen the differences between the present device as that of the IKEDA et al. reference, applicant has amended claim 1 to further recite that the information input device is a pointing device. This feature of the present device is described throughout the present disclosure, including the passage beginning on page 4, line 16, with reference to element 320.

For at least the reason that neither the camera 400 or any other element of the IKEDA et al. device can reasonably be construed as a pointing device, the IKEDA et al. reference necessarily fails to disclose the full set of features of claim 1, and by extension fails to disclose the full set of features recited by any other claim that depends therefrom.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this anticipation rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 4-7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over IKEDA et al. in view of GAULD et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

The Official Action acknowledges that the IKEDA et al. reference fails to disclose a pointing device disposed on a 2-axis hinge. The secondary GAULD et al. reference is offered merely for its asserted teaching of such element, with particular reference drawn to element 17 of the GAULD et al. device, illustrated in Figure 1 thereof.

While the GAULD et al. reference clearly disclosed a pointing device provided in connection with a mobile terminal, there remains neither any teaching or suggestion in the applied or any other prior art to provide such a user input device specifically positioned on a 2-axis hinge. As noted above, the primary IKEDA et al. reference fails to offer any teaching or suggestion of such a hinge, and the secondary GAULD et al. reference fails to overcome this shortcoming.

In support of the combination of references, the Official Action offers as the source of motivation to combine the references nothing more than the desire to provide an intuitive user interface. However, nowhere is there any identified source of the suggestion that placing a pointing device on a 2-axis hinge would provide for an intuitive user interface for the user. Furthermore, the element of the IKEDA et al. device that is positioned on the single-axis hinge is a camera. While this may be characterized as a data input device, it is by no means a user input device by any stretch.

As a result, there remains an as yet an unbridged gap between the single-axis hinge mounted camera of IKEDA et al. and the pointing user input device of GAULD et al. The two devices are of such different character, that applicant suggests that one cannot reasonably suggest the other, nor does any third reference suggest the combination.

For all of these reasons, applicant respectfully suggests that the present obviousness rejection cannot reasonably be maintained, and reconsideration and withdrawal of such rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 8 and 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over IKEDA et al. in view of SCHMITT et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

The Official Action offers the SCHMITT et al. reference only for its asserted teaching or suggestion of a fingerprint sensor. However, regardless of the ability of this reference to teach or suggest that for which it is specifically offered, it nevertheless fails to overcome the shortcomings of the IKEDA et al. reference, considered in detail in connection with both the anticipation rejection and the first obviousness rejection detailed above.

The Official Action rejects claims 13-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over IKEDA et al. in view of KIM.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

The Official Action offers the KIM reference only for its asserted teaching or suggestion of a magnetic sensor. However, regardless of the ability of this reference to teach or suggest that for which it is specifically offered, it nevertheless fails to overcome the shortcomings of the IKEDA et al. reference, considered in detail in connection with both the anticipation rejection and the first obviousness rejection detailed above.

The Official Action rejects claims 20-22 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over IKEDA et al. in view of WADA et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

The Official Action offers the WADA et al. reference only for its asserted teaching or suggestion of a lock unit. However, regardless of the ability of this reference to teach or suggest that for which it is specifically offered, it nevertheless fails to overcome the shortcomings of the IKEDA et al. reference, considered in detail in connection with both the anticipation rejection and the first obviousness rejection detailed above.

The Official Action rejects claim 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over IKEDA et al. in view of WADA et al. and further in view of SCHMITT et al. Reconsideration and

withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

The Official Action offers the WADA et al. and SCHMITT et al. references only for the features associated with these references as noted in connection with the obviousness rejections already considered above. However, regardless of the ability of either of these references to teach or suggest that for which it is specifically offered, these references nevertheless fail to overcome the shortcomings of the IKEDA et al. reference, considered in detail in connection with both the anticipation rejection and the first obviousness rejection detailed above.

In addition to the amendment of the original claims discussed above, Applicant has added new claims 25-28. Of these, each of claims 25-27 depends ultimately from amended independent claim 1. Claim 28 is a new independent claim.

Claim 25 recites that the two axes of the 2-axis hinge are a folding axis and a rotation axis. The upper housing, the lower housing, and the 2-axis hinge are constructed and arranged so that an end face of the 2-axis hinge on the horizontal axis is exposed to an outside of the mobile terminal both when the mobile terminal is in an open position and when the mobile terminal is in a closed position. This set of features is believed to be neither disclosed, taught, nor suggested by any known combination of prior art references.

Claims 26 and 27 recite that the end face is exposed on a side face of the lower housing, and that the pointing device is arranged on the end face of the 2-axis hinge.

Claim 28 is a new independent claim that recites a set of features believed to be absent from any know combination of prior art or any single such reference.

If the Examiner has any questions or requires further clarification of any of the above points, the Examiner may contact the undersigned attorney so that this application may continue to be expeditiously advanced.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Eric Jensen/  
Eric Jensen, Reg. No. 37,855  
745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

EJ/lrs